

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	261833
Site Address:	64 Meadow Road, Earley, Wokingham, RG6 7EX
Expiry Date:	29 September 2026
Site Visit Date:	10 August 2026
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a single storey front extension plus single storey rear extension to include changes to fenestration.	

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP3 – General Principles for Development CP9 – Scale and Location of Development Proposals
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC02 – Development Limits CC07 – Parking
Wokingham Borough Local Plan Update (LPU)	SS1 – Sustainable development principles SS2 – Spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy SS3 – Development within or adjacent to major and modest settlements C1 – Active and sustainable transport and accessibility C2 – Mitigation of transport impacts and highway safety and design C5 – Parking and electric vehicle charging DH1 – Place making and quality design DH2 – Safeguarding amenity
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: Request for further information
WBC CIL

External

None

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	No objection
---------------------	--------------

Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description:

The property is a detached single storey dwelling originally constructed in the 1950s. The property is made of a traditional red brick construction and is set back from the highway by a modest sized driveway. The plot also contains a detached garage and a single storey part rear extension along the boundary with 62 Meadow Road. Meadow Road is comprised of single storey dwellings on its southern end, however, 64 Meadow Road marks a transition towards two storey dwellings which dominate the northern end of the road.

Proposal:

The proposed development is a single storey front extension to form a porch and a single storey rear extension, along with changes to fenestration. The single storey rear extension only covers part of the rear elevation, along the border with 66 and incorporates the detached garage

Principle of Development:

The National Planning Policy Framework has an underlying presumption in favour of sustainable development which is carried through to the local Development Plan. The Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy CC01 states that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The site is located within settlement limits and as such the development should be acceptable providing that it complies with the principles stated in the Development Plan and all other material consideration.

Design/Character of the Area:

Policy DP3 (1) of the NPPF states that proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so they integrate with their surroundings. Policy CP3(a) of the Core Strategy states proposals should be of an appropriate scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area together with a high quality of design.

Section 4.11 of the Borough Design Guide, under R23, provides guidance on extensions.

The Design Guide states the following in relation to Rear Extensions:

Rear extensions should not project more than four metres from the main rear wall where they are close to a side boundary.

On terraced houses, 2 storey rear extensions must be carefully positioned and designed to minimise any potential impact upon neighbours.

Maximum eaves and ridge height should be no more than those of the existing property

In addition, for porches, the Design Guide states that:

- Porches should generally project less than 2m forward of the building line
- Generally acceptable where the building is set back from the street frontage in a large plot

It also states that a gap should be retained between the building and the site boundary and this should be a minimum of 1m in width.

In terms of the rear extension, the development complies with R16 as a gap of 2m is maintained along the boundary with number 66. In addition, it complies with R23 as it has a depth of 3.15m and does not extend above the height of the existing roof due to its single storey nature. However, the eaves are taller than the existing dwelling, nevertheless they reflect the eaves height of the existing rear extension and thus appear as a coherent and subordinate addition in keeping with the existing property. The proposed rear extension is single storey in nature and would not be visible from the public domain, and therefore the visual effect of the extension poses no harm to the character of the area.

In terms of the porch, the development complies with the requirements of the design guide as it extends out only 1.65m from the front elevation. In addition, 64 Meadow Road has a modest plot size and is set back off the road via a driveway. The porch will be constructed with matching brick material and has an appropriate pitched roof design. Its material and modest scale mean that it will not be out of place on Meadow Road in accordance with DP3(1) of the NPPF and CP3 of the Core Strategy.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Policy CP3(a) of the Core Strategy states proposals should not result in detriment to the amenities of adjoining land users including open spaces or occupiers and their quality of life.

The Design Guide SPD states that the side walls of extensions must not contain windows especially at first floor level, to minimise any potential impact upon the privacy of neighbours. It also states that the eaves height of single storey extensions should not exceed 3m within 2m of a side boundary.

Overlooking and Loss of Light:

The proposed single storey rear extension would extend 3.15 metres from the rear of the dwelling and would be single storey in nature. Its modest depth, single storey nature and 2m separation from the boundary means that no harmful loss of light is expected.

There are windows proposed on the south elevation of the rear extension, but these are proposed to be obscure glazed. The ground floor windows for bedroom 1 and the bathroom facing no.66 would not result in harmful overlooking. Whilst the fence line is low, the neighbour could build a 2m high fence under permitted development without planning permission. The proposed 3 windows and 1 door would match what neighbouring property no.66 has on their north facing side elevation. Two of these windows are obscure glazed. Although the windows proposed to be added to the

existing dwelling on the south elevation will face onto windows at no.66, it is considered that with an appropriate condition applied to ensure that these are obscure glazed, no harmful overlooking will be introduced. The windows proposed in the extended part of the south elevation will also be conditioned, but it appears that these windows will largely not face onto no.66's side wall.

Additional windows on the front and rear elevations do not pose overlooking concerns due to the adequate separation between neighbouring properties.

In addition, the single storey front porch extends 1.65m from the front of the dwelling and has a pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.7m. It is 2.3m wide. The porch is proposed to be centrally positioned, over 5m from each boundary and no side windows are proposed. Therefore, there are no issues on neighbouring amenity terms through overlooking or loss of light.

Overbearing:

To avoid being overbearing, guidance in the BDG states that the eaves height of single storey extension should not exceed 3 metres within 2 metres of a side boundary. The single storey rear extension is 2m from the boundary and has an eaves height of 2.55m and therefore accords with this guidance. The flat roof of the extension means there is not any additional mass or bulk above this height which would create a concern on overlooking. The porch is over 5m from the boundaries and has a maximum height of 3.7m. It is proposed to be of a modest scale and does not represent a concern for overbearing.

Highway Access and Parking Provision:

Policy CC07 of the MDD states that development should retain an overall suitable level of parking. Parking provisions are set out in Appendix 2 of the MDD.

WBC Highways notes the following 'the proposal would result in an increase to 5 habitable rooms which would need 2 parking spaces. They note that 2 parking spaces can be accommodated but the proposed parking to the north can unlikely be accessed via the existing dropped crossing and boundary treatment. They propose that to serve the parking layout the dropped crossing will need to be repositioned, requiring a separate consent. Alternatively, they say the applicant could consider removing or repositioning the porch to retain at least a 7.5m driveway clearance.'

WBC Highways note that overall, the application is considered acceptable on highway grounds. The garage is acceptable cycle parking space.

It is not considered that the parking on site will be changed due to the proposed work, and it is trusted that the occupiers of the dwelling could manage their parking arrangements without the addition of a dropped kerb given there is sufficient driveway space available. It is not considered necessary to amend the access to the property due to the modest scale of the extensions proposed. Amendments have therefore not been requested.

Amenity Space:

Section 4 of the BDG provides guidance on the provision of amenity space and recommends that 11 metres is a minimum depth for private garden space. On this occasion the implementation of a rear extension measuring 3.15 metres in depth does not conflict with this guidance as garden space of approximately 33m remains.

Conclusion:

For the reasons stated above, the proposal is acceptable in local plan policy terms and therefore is recommended for approval.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL): When planning permission is granted for a development that is CIL liable, the Council will issue a liability notice as soon as practicable after the day on which the planning permission first permits development. Completing the assumption of liability notice is a statutory requirement to be completed for all CIL liable applications.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010): In determining this application the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that persons with protected characteristics as identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application and there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditions agreed:	Yes/No/Not required
Recommendation:	
Date:	11 August 2026
Earliest date for decision:	28 August 2026

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	24 September 2026

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Affordable Housing Thresholds | Total count: 3

#	NAME
1	Within Major Development Locations
2	Within Major Development Locations
3	Within All Development Locations

Scale and Location of Development Proposals | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	NAME
1	Major Development Locations	Earley

Major Nuclear Sites Consultation Zone | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	FEATURE_NAME	PLANNING_NOTE
1	Consultation Zone - Major Nuclear Site	AWE: 12km Zone	This is the 12km Zone. A circular zone of 12km radius around all nuclear sites, for certain types of significant development due to the potential for such developments to pose an external hazard to sites.

Aerodrome Safeguarding: Heathrow Consultation Zone | Total count: 1

#	Height Band	Wind Turbine	Aviation
1	All works exceeding 150 metres (492.1 feet)	NO	YES

Overhead Electricity Cables | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	OBJECTID
1	Overhead Electricity Cable Consultation Zone	1

Great Crested Newt Impact Risk Zones | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	FEATURE_NAME	CONSULT
1	Great Crested Newt Impact Risk Zone	Green	Consult NatureSpace for Major developments only

SSSI Impact Risk Zones | Total count: 1

#	IRZURL
1	https://irz.geodata.org.uk/IRZ/step2.html?irzcode=0301000530000&notes=&location=480914,172519%20(IRZ%20polygon%20centre)

Landscape Character Assessment 2019 | Total count: 1

#	FEATURE_TYPE	Name
1	Landscape Character Assessment 2019	Woodley-Earley Settled and Farmed Clay

Wards | Total count: 1

#	Name of area	Closest Approximate Distance
1	Maiden Erlegh & Whitegates Ward	0 m

Parishes | Total count: 1

#	Name of area	Closest Approximate Distance
1	Earley CP	0 m